

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

11 OBDULIO RECINOS,)
12 Petitioner,)
13 vs.)
14 ROBERT LEGRAND, *et al.*,)
15 Respondents.)
16 _____/

3:11-cv-00492-HDM-WGC

ORDER

17 This is a habeas corpus petition pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 in which petitioner, a state
18 prisoner, is proceeding *pro se*. Before the court is respondents' motion to dismiss (ECF #11), which was
19 filed on September 30, 2011. Petitioner has not opposed the motion, despite having received notice from
20 the court of the requirements of *Klingele v. Eikenberry* and *Rand v. Rowland* on October 3, 2011 (ECF
21 #13).

22 In the motion to dismiss, respondents contend that the petition must be dismissed with
23 prejudice as untimely (ECF #11).¹ *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d). Respondents also argue that the petition
24 contains unexhausted claims and thus is also subject to dismissal as a mixed petition. *See* 28 U.S.C. §

25
26 ¹ The court notes that the exhibits provided by respondents demonstrate that the petition is indeed
untimely.

1 2254(b). Pursuant to the provisions of Local Rule 7-2, petitioner's failure to respond to the motion is
2 a concession on his part that the arguments are valid. Therefore, the motion to dismiss shall be granted.

3 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that respondents' motion to dismiss the petition with
4 prejudice (ECF #11) is **GRANTED**.

5 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** the Clerk shall **ENTER JUDGMENT** accordingly and
6 close this case.

7 DATED this 23rd day of January, 2012.

8 
9

10

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26